

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action mailed on December 29, 2003 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Claims 1-25 remain pending in the application, with claim 26 having been withdrawn from consideration in view of a previously imposed restriction requirement. Claims 1, 12, and 20 are the pending independent claims. Claims 1-3, 12-14, and 20-22 have been amended. The embodiment encompassed by Claims 7-11 is cancelled. No new matter is believed to have been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I. CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 12, 15, 20 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,955,810 (Umeda et al).

Newly amended independent Claim 1 recites a stator for a rotating electrical machine that comprises, *inter alia*, at least one stator coil having a non-slot-insertion segment having a non-twisted apex at a predetermined position thereon, a first non-twisted segment and a second non-twisted segment interposed by a twisted segment, the first and second non-twisted segments each having a non-twisted section adjacent the first and second slot-insertion segments, respectively.

Independent Claim 12 has also been amended and now recites a rotating electrical machine, comprising, *inter alia*, at least one stator coil having a non-slot-insertion segment having, a non-twisted apex, a first non-twisted segment and a second non-twisted segment interposed by a twisted segment, the first and second non-twisted segments each having a non-twisted section adjacent the first and second slot-insertion segments, respectively.

Independent Claim 20 has also been amended to now recite a coil for insertion into a stator core, comprising, *inter alia*, the non-slot-insertion segment having a non-twisted apex, a first non-twisted segment and a second non-twisted segment interposed by a twisted segment, the first and second non-twisted segments each having a non-twisted section adjacent the first and second slot-insertion segments, respectively.

Appl. No. 10/075,894

Reply to Office Action of December 29, 2003

Umeda teaches an alternator for a vehicle that includes a stator having a plurality of approximately U-shaped segments mounted thereon, wherein the segment 90 has two straight line portions 91, parts of which are inserted in the core, and a bridge portion 95 connecting the straight line portions 91, where the bridge portion 95 is not inserted in the core. The straight line portion 91 has a fold portion 92 approximately at its center. See col. 9, l. 61-col. 10, l. 11.

However, Umeda does not remotely suggest a coil having a non-twisted apex, that is recited in newly amended Claims 1, 12, and 20 and clearly illustrated in FIGS. 3, 4, and 5 of the Applicants' application. Contrary to the Applicants' invention, as shown in the figures that the Examiner cites, namely FIGS. 6, 7, and 8, the segments illustrated therein show the fold portion 92 on what looks to be an apex.

Moreover, Umeda does not remotely suggest a coil having a first non-twisted segment and a second non-twisted segment interposed by a twisted segment, the first and second non-twisted segments each having a non-twisted section adjacent the first and second slot-insertion segments, respectively. Instead, the figures that the Examiner cites to in Umeda appear to show twist that begins as soon as the bridge portion 95 and straight line portions 91 meet. See FIG. 7. Therefore, Umeda is deficient in disclosing or teaching at least these two features recited in Claims 1, 12, and 20 and the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 4 depends from Claim 1, claim 15 depends from Claim 12, and Claim 23 depends from Claim 20. Therefore, the Applicants rely on the above arguments for the dependent claims and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection.

II. CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 103

a. Umeda

Claims 2-3, 7-9, 13-14, and 21-22 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Umeda. Because Claims 2-3 depend from Claim 1, Claims 13-14 depend from Claim 12, and Claims 21-22 depend from Claim 20, the Applicants rely on the

Appl. No. 10/075,894

Reply to Office Action of December 29, 2003

arguments presented above for the dependent claims and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection.

b. Umeda in view of Asao

Claims 5-6, 10-11, 16-17, and 24-25 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,525,443B2 (Asao). These claims depend from newly amended independent claims 1, 12, and 20, therefore, the Applicants rely on the arguments presented above for these dependent claims. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

c. Umeda in view of Couture

Claims 18-19 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Umeda further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,714,824 (Couture). Because Claims 18-19 depend from Claim 12, the Applicants rely on the arguments presented above for these dependent claims and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection.

Based on the above, independent claims 1, 12, and 20 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because they recite features which are patentable in their own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103, have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the application, as amended, is now in condition for allowance, and such allowance is therefore earnestly requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorneys at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent

Appl. No. 10/075,894

Reply to Office Action of December 29, 2003

abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 3/26, 2004

By: 

Cindy H. Kwacala

Reg. No. 47,667

(480) 385-5060